CF0000118020

(2)



CFISV

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH AT JABALPUR

Criminal Revision No. 1157 of 2000

1. Hukum Chand Soni son of Shri Komal Prasad Soni, Aged about 45 years, by occupation teacher, resident of Shankar Nagar, Durg

2. Smt. Kanti Devi Soni Wife of Hukum Chand Soni, aged about 40 years, by occupation Teacher, Shanker Nagar, Durg.

.... Petitioners.

_V_E_R_S_U_S_

① State of M.P. .... Respondent.

② Omprakash Tamrakar S/O Chandulal Tamrakar aged about 40 years R/O Shankar Nagar Durg

Criminal Revision U/s 397/401 Criminal Procedure Code.

(23)

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक CRR 1154/2000 सन् 200

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
06/09/2001 :-	Shri F.S. Khare, learned counsel for the applicants. Shri Ashish Shukla, learned counsel for the State. Shri H.B. Agrawal, learned counsel for the non-applicant No.2. Parties are heard. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that non-applicant No.2 in fact played a fraud and made certain interpolations in the original agreement, therefore, the applicants have instituted a private complaint against him and the present ~~petition~~ complaint filed by the non-applicant No.2 is an abuse of the process of law. He further submits that from the documents it would clearly appear that an agreement was executed and thereafter the present non-applicant No.2 made certain interpolations in the original agreement. Learned counsel for the non-applicant No.2, on	Notice 4.9 6.9. disp for st

[पीछे देखिये

आदेश पत्रक (पुर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
1+2	the other hand submits that the arguments raised by the applicants in fact are the defences of the applicants which are to be raised during the course of the trial and are still required to be proved. After going through the records I do not consider present to be a fit case for interference at this stage because the applicants still have an opportunity to submit their case before the trial Court and prove their defences. The petition is dismissed. **Sd/-** **R.S. Garg** **Judge**	

GRPRJ—FS/311—1/2001—50,000.